Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/592,014	KATO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	DAVID SIMMONS	1791
All Participants:	Status of Application:	<u> </u>
(1) <u>DAVID SIMMONS</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Mr.Posz</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>12 May 2010</u>	Time: <u>10 am</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: none		
Claims discussed: 4-7		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated that the notion of causing gas to move through an adhesive layer from bottomed holes in a realease sheet as claimed was allowable over any prior art found by the examiner in his search of claims 4-7 (elected). However, certain language as proposed in the examiner's amendment would clarify the language of the claims. Mr Posz submitted proposed changes in a FAX which were adopted by the examiner in his examiner's amendment. Claims to the non-elected invention were also authorized to be cancelled..